

1. Provide the property value studies referenced during the meeting.

The academic study *Does cleanup of hazardous waste sites raise housing values? Evidence of spatially localized benefits* by Shanti Gamper-Rabindran and Christopher Timmins is the one we cite for the statement on the Superfund website saying “residential property values within three miles of Superfund sites increased 18.6-24.5 percent when sites were cleaned up and deleted from the National Priorities List.”

<http://www.durangoherald.com/article/20150919/NEWS01/150919530/What-will-Superfund-do-to-property-values-->

2. Does 18% increase in property values after Superfund designation take into account increases in housing values across the board?

3. What are the exact number of Superfund Sites on the NPL?

As of September 9, 2015, there are 1320 federal and non-federal (general) sites final on the NPL, and 51 federal and non-federal (general) sites proposed for the NPL. More information can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/index.htm>.

4. How many NPL sites have been deleted from the NPL?

As of September 9, 2015, 389 federal and non-federal (general) sites have been deleted from the NPL. Further, 81 partial deletions have occurred at 62 sites. More information can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/index.htm>.

5. How many NPL sites are construction complete?

As of September 9, 2015, 1174 NPL sites are construction complete. More information can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/index.htm>.

6. What is the average time on the NPL list (from listing and cleanup)? Mathy committed to getting a more representative number for similar mining impacted sites.

7. What would the course of a cleanup look like?

The Superfund cleanup process is complex. It involves the steps taken to assess sites, place them on the National Priorities List, and establish and implement appropriate cleanup plans. The first step following NPL listing is a comprehensive remedial investigation followed by the development of feasible cleanup alternatives. Once a cleanup is selected, with input from the community, the remedy is designed and the cleanup work begins.

8. How would the boundaries be determined? What are they likely to be? What is the process?

Normally, an NPL site is defined by the known sources and releases of hazardous substances. Once the site is placed on the NPL, the scope of the work can be expanded to the extent that the contamination has migrated, but may be limited to those addressing only those source areas named in the original listing.

Because there are numerous potential sources, EPA could define the boundaries of the "site" based on available data on all of the current source areas. If the scope of the site is limited (ie: to just Cement Creek) then the EPA may be limited in cleaning up sources outside of the scope without having to create a separate, new NPL site.

For this project we would expect there to be a great deal of conversation about the study area so it was clear and transparent and so that everyone understood the ramifications.

9. How is the state involved financially with superfund cleanup and O and M?

As a statutory requirement, states contribute a "cost share" equal to 10 percent of the fund-financed costs of the remedial action and are responsible for long-term operation and maintenance following the completion of the cleanup.

10. What is the total budget for sites on the list?

The Superfund program operates on the principle that polluters should pay for the cleanups, rather than passing the costs to taxpayers. EPA searches for parties legally responsible for the contamination at sites and it holds those parties accountable for the costs of cleanups. For the newly added sites without viable potentially responsible parties, EPA will investigate the full extent of the contamination before starting substantial cleanup at the site. EPA uses the Superfund appropriation to address sites where there are no viable, liable parties. Congress appropriates funding for the Superfund program, and sources for these appropriations have drawn on a mixture of funds from general revenues and the Trust Fund. Superfund appropriation-levels have remained relatively constant in nominal terms since the Superfund tax expired (but have not been adjusted for inflation). EPA's Hazardous Substance Superfund enacted appropriation for FY 2015 was \$1088.8 million dollars.

11. A precise date and timeline for a report based on collected data that shows our eligibility for the NPL.

12. How long have other sites been on the NPL and given the history of our site, how long do you expect we will remain on the list?

13. Is all the data collected in the County available for community review?

Data collected on the Animas River in LaPlata County is available on the EPA website. Data collected at individual properties is being provided to property owners. That data includes private well sampling data.

14. How many people will be working in San Juan County next year? When will they come and for how long?

As stated in EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy's prepared testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Oversight and Government Reform Committee and Natural Resources Committee "All the affected residents of Colorado and New Mexico and members of the Southern Ute, Ute Mountain Ute, and Navajo Nation Tribes can be assured that the EPA has and will continue to take responsibility to help ensure that the Gold King Mine release is cleaned up."

EPA has solicited comments from state, local, and tribal stakeholders on a long term monitoring plan. Comments are due on October 8th. However, until the plan is finalized, the number of EPA personnel involved in its implementation cannot be predicted.

15. How is the EPA measuring for potential harmful airborne dust from the accumulated remnants of the spill on the banks of Cement Creek drainage and Animas River below Cement Creek?

EPA does not anticipate any changes in air quality due to the release at the Gold King Mine on August 5, 2015.

16. Will Historical Structures be preserved and protected?

Under Superfund, EPA must comply with the substantive portions of all applicable regulations, including those governing cultural resources. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) states that it is the federal government's responsibility to use all practicable means to preserve historic, cultural and natural aspects of our national heritage. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 established a process by which federal agencies must incorporate historic resource issues. Section 106 of the Act requires a federal agency with jurisdiction over a federal undertaking to take into account the effects of that undertaking on properties included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. If adverse effects are anticipated, agreement is usually reached on measures that avoid or

mitigate the effects. Two examples where EPA has worked with local stakeholders to preserve historical areas/structures are the Tar Creek Superfund site in Quapaw, Oklahoma and the Silver Bow Creek/Butte area Superfund site in Butte, Montana.

17. Has a Superfund proposal for the Forest Service Lands been presented? If so, has the agency responded?

18. Has a Superfund proposal for the Bureau of Land Management been presented? If so, has the agency responded?

19. What is the timeline for public participation?

One of the questions posed at the meeting last Friday was “What is the timeline for public participation?” I would suggest providing the “This is Superfund” booklet to answer this question

(<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/community/today/pdfs/TIS%20FINAL%209.13.11.pdf>). Not only does it tell when the legally required community involvement activities takes place, it discusses some of the optional activities that we often include at our sites. It also has some good general information about the Superfund process that I think would be useful to the communities. We can provide hard copies for distribution if appropriate.